



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,357	07/04/2002	Shih-Sheng Huang	PMXP0142USA	9626
27765	7765 7590 01/25/2006		EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506			NELSON, ALECIA DIANE	
	MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PAPER NUMBER
	,		2675	·

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/064,357	HUANG, SHIH-SHENG			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Alecia D. Nelson	2675			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
′—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,14,16-18 and 20-22</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,14,16-18 and 20-22</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	<u> </u>					
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment		🗀 .				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		4) Ll Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Inforn	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 14, 16, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shirai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,452).

With reference to **claim 14**, Shirai et al. teaches an electronic device comprising: a base (12) with a surface (26); an induction coil (14) installed corresponding to a position of the surface (see Figures 1A-B). With further reference to **claims 14 and 22**, Shirai et al. teaches a magnet installed inside the base for aligning the induction coil of the electric device with an external induction coil in a housing having a magnet corresponding to the position of the magnet installed inside the base, in teaching that an electromagnetic induction is generated when the primary coil and the secondary coil are in vicinity of one another thereby creating a magnetic force (see column 3, lines 4-33).

With reference to **claim 16**, Shirai et al. teaches the electronic device further comprises a power source (32) coupled to the induction coil for supplying the induction coil with electrical power (see column 3, lines 62-67).

Art Unit: 2675

With reference to **claim 17**, Shirai et al. teaches the electronic device further comprising: a power module (36) electrically connected to the induction coil for transforming an induced magnetic field received by the induction coil to corresponding electrical power; and a storage module (54) for storing the electrical power generated by the power module (see column 4, lines 3-68).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 1-6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirai et al.

With reference to **claims 1, 5, 6, and 18**, Shirai et al. teaches an induction charging apparatus comprised of a device unit (18, wireless device) and a power device (12, power source unit), wherein the induction power device comprising: a base (12) with a flat plate (26); and a first induction coil (14) installed corresponding to a position of the flat-plate for transforming an electrical power of a power source (32) to an induction magnetic field (see column 2, lines 58-65, column 3, lines 62-67) and the wireless pointing device (18) comprising; a housing (24) with a contact plane (28) corresponding to the flat-plate (26); a second induction coil (16) installed inside the

Application/Control Number: 10/064,357

Art Unit: 2675

housing corresponding to a position of the contact plane for receiving the induction magnetic field through the contact plane in a magnetic induction manner (see column 3, lines 3-9), wherein an effective cross-sectional area of the second induction coil being smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the first induction coil (see Figure1B, column 3, lines 27-46); a power module (74) electrically connected to the second induction coil (14) for transforming the induction magnetic field received by the second induction coil (16) to a corresponding electrical power; and a storage module (30) for storing the electrical power generated by the power module so that the storage module is capable of providing the electrical power to the wireless pointing device (18); wherein when the contact plane of the wireless pointing device (18) is put on the flat-plate (26) of the induction power device (12), the second induction coil (16) of the wireless pointing device receives the induction magnetic field generated by the first induction coil (14) so that the wireless pointing device is capable of being charged by the induction power device (see Figures 1A-B, column 3, lines 18-33).

While all that is required is as explained above with reference to **claims 1 and 18**, Shirai et al. fails to specifically teach that the electronic device (18) comprises a control key fro generating a control signal or a signal module connected to the control key for transmitting the control signal through radio waves, or a receiving module for receiving the radio control signals, as recited in **claim 6**.

The examiner takes Offical Notice in that the usage of a control key and a signal module for transmitting the control signal through radio waves and a receiving module

for receiving the radio control signals are well known to those skilled in the art and are typical to be included in input devices, more specifically wireless type input devices.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the wireless electronic device as taught by Shirai et al. to be a wireless mouse device containing a control key and a signal module for transmitting control signals generated by the control key as well known in conventional mouse device in order to provide a wireless mouse device which is capable of being charged by an induction power device in a manner to achieve optimum power for the wireless device.

With reference to **claims 2-4**, while Shirai et al. teaches the usage of a fixer for aligning the induction coil of the device with an external coil, there fails to be any disclosure of the fixer being a magnet.

However, in the disclosure of Shirai et al. the teachings of the fixer is carryout by the usage of a depressible member (78), which has guide plates extending downwardly from the four sides of the rectangular cover plate being slightly smaller than the opening (see column 5, line 45-column 6, line 8). In addition to the usage of the guide plates there is also disclosed, the usage of an engaging projection (104) for being inserted into engaging hole (102) (see column 6, lines 45-53) and a projection (130) serving as a first engaging means which is fitted in an opening (132) serving as a second engaging means, both of which maintain the device in a position to allow the magnetic coupling of the coils (see column 7, lines 14-28). Further, Shirai et al. teaches that an

electromagnetic induction is generated when the primary coil and the secondary coil are in vicinity of one another thereby creating a magnetic force (see column 3, lines 4-9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow the usage a magnet as a fixer, wherein the fixer is used in a position similarly to that which is taught by Shirai et al. for the purpose of maintaining the device in a position to allow the magnetic coupling of the coils. Thereby allowing optimum charging of the device through the usage of induction coupling.

5. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirai et al. as applied to claims 1-6 and 14-18 above, and further in view of Katabami (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,002).

With reference to **claims 20 and 21**, Shirai et al. teaches all that is required as explained above, however in teaching the usage of a contact plane whish is substantially smaller than the surface of the flat plate such that the housing can be moved across the flat plate, or that the width of the flat-plane is at least twice a width of the contact plane.

Katabami teaches the usage of a pen (5) having a contact plane (3) that is substantially smaller than the surface of the flat plate (6) such that the housing can be moved across the flat plate. Further Katabami teaches that the width of the flat-plate (6) is at least twice a width of the contact plane (3) (See Figure 1A).

Therefore it would have been obvious to allow the usage of a pen device to be used to contact the surface of the flat plate similar to that which is taught by Katabami to

Art Unit: 2675

be used in a manner similar to that which is taught by Shirai et al. in order to provide quick and easy charging of the pen device this thereby reducing the power required to operate the device.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While the applicant argues that the reference fails to teach a device that allows for mouse-like movement during charging, this is unclaimed subject matter and will not be addressed by the examiner. As to the applicant's arguments concerning a second induction coil of an effective cross-sectional area smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the first induction coil, it is the examiner's position that the teachings of Shirai et al. teaches the limitation in teaching that which is explained above (see column 3, lines 27-46) wherein it is taught that the size of the second device is smaller then the housing containing the primary coil. Further it is also stated by Shirai et al. that the charging apparatus can be used for various kinds of electric apparatuses such as electric tools and the like (see column 1, lines 6-16). More specifically an electric tool could be considered a pen device or the like similar to that which is disclosed Katabami (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,002) or Aoki (U.S. Patent No. 6,670, 561). With further reference to the applicant's arguments concerning the usage of magnetic fixers, it is the examiner's position that when creating a magnetic field, a magnetic force is thereby generated. Therefore the coils of the devices act as a magnet attracting one to the other.

Art Unit: 2675

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alecia D. Nelson whose telephone number is 571-272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2675

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

adn/ADN January 13, 2006

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER